



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES April 17, 2013

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park
3000 Granny White Pike
Nashville, Tennessee 37204
Telephone: (615) 862-7970
Fax: (615) 862-7974

Commissioners Present: Brian Tibbs (Chair), Menié Bell, Rose Cantrell, Richard Fletcher, Hunter Gee, Aaron Kaalberg, Ann Nielson

Zoning Staff: Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Tim, Walker (Director), Susan T. Jones (City Attorney)

Applicants: Jim Ritchie, Randy Robinson, Preston Quirk, Scott Smith, John Brittle,

Public: Jim Schmidt, Kristen Dinger, Laura Garfield

Chairperson Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m. and read aloud the processes for the consent agenda and appealing the decisions of the Metro Historic Zoning Commission.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commission Cantrell moved to approve the minutes for the March, 2013 meeting. Commissioner Bell seconded and the minutes were unanimously approved.

II. DESIGNATION

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, explained the design guidelines for the proposed Salemtown overlay. *Note: The overlay still requires a final reading with the Metro Council before it is officially adopted and that is planned for May 7, 2013.*

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Vice-chair moved to accept the design guidelines and Commissioner Fletcher second. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Tibbs explained the process of the consent agenda and the appeal process. Mr. Alexander, staff for the Commission stated that 105 Lindsley Park Drive will be removed from consent and that 2926 Westmoreland should be removed as sufficient information to hear the case was not received.

III. CONSENT

c. 700 MONROE STREET

Application: Signage; Setback reduction

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1915809

e. 3723 CENTRAL AVENUE

Application: Demolition; New construction-outbuilding; Setback reduction

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1915500

f. 915 FATHERLAND STREET

Application: New construction
Council District: 06
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER
Permit ID #: 1915978

g. 2616 BELMONT BLVD

Application: New construction-addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER
Permit ID #: 1915975

h. 1410 GALE LANE

Application: New construction--outbuilding; Setback reduction
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1915818

j. 1222 7th AVENUE NORTH

Application: New construction - addition
Council District: 19
Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1916025

Chairperson Tibbs explained the process of the consent agenda and the appeal process. Mr. Alexander, staff for the Commission stated that 105 Lindsley Park Drive will be moved to "New Business" and that 2926 Westmoreland should be removed as sufficient information to hear the case was not received. He went on to provide a short description of all other projects remaining on consent and stated that staff recommended approval with conditions.

There was no request from the public for any other items to be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Motion:

Commissioner Nielson moved to accept the revised consent agenda with applicable conditions. Commissioner Kaalberg seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

d. 105 LINDSLEY PARK DRIVE

Application: New construction-addition; Setback reduction
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1915514

Mr. Alexander presented the case for 105 Lindsley Park Drive.

Commissioner Fletcher asked how the height of the addition would compare to heights of homes in the vicinity and Mr. Alexander stated that they would be comparable.

Commissioner Gee asked about the south elevation and projection that doesn't show on the plan and Mr. Alexander explained that it was a drawing error that the applicant was aware and the plan is accurate.

Jim Ritchie explained that they wanted to demolish the house but after talking with staff and trying to work with the neighbors they now propose an addition. The current house is a 1-bedroom and they need additional square footage for living purposes and value of the home. They increased the square footage and kept the front elevation. The 18" lowering of the eave height requested by staff is not possible because it reduces the head-height and there wouldn't be enough for a second story.

Chairperson Tibbs asked if the ceiling is vaulted, what is the interior head clearance and Mr. Ritchie stated that it would be 8'.

There were no requests from the public to speak and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Kaalberg expressed concern over the height of the addition and the fact that it also bumps out the side. These are things they don't typically approve, he explained, but there is an unusual lot in this case. He is hesitant to set a precedent that any house can be turned into a 2200 square foot house regardless of the original size of the building.

Vice-chairperson Nielson asked if a precedent is set; how many houses will it affect and Mr. Alexander responded that staff had not conducted that research but he believed the percentage was small since there are few small, gable-front homes in the neighborhood.

Commissioners asked for clarifications of the details of the case and Mr. Alexander provided information from the staff recommendation and staff's review of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Gee pointed out that the house already sits back from the street, compared to other typical houses and therefore the addition was setback an appropriate amount. He stated that the scale was compatible with the neighborhood but he wasn't sure about the lowering of the 18" eave. Mr. Alexander explained that the challenge with lowering the eave wasn't about the ceiling height itself but that that was the location of the staircase.

Commissioner Bell noted that the plan was an improvement since the request last month was to demolish the historic building.

Motion:

Commissioner Gee moved to approve the reduced setback due to the constraints of the site and to approve the project as drawn with the conditions that:

- the applicant work with staff to reduce the eave height on the front of the two story addition as much as possible;

Commissioner Kaalberg seconded. Commissioner Gee amended his motion to include the conditions that:

- Four inch window casings and corner boards be added;
- The window and foundation material, and the roof color be approved by staff;
- Any new or relocated appurtenances be approved by staff;
- Material information and major proportions be labeled on the drawings.

Commissioner Kaalberg seconded the amendment to include the additional conditions of the staff recommendation. The amended motion passed unanimously.

k. 1313 SHELBY AVENUE

Application: Demolition

Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER
Permit ID #: 1912069

1313 Shelby was removed from the agenda at the owner's consent.

I. 414 GREENWAY AVENUE

Application: New construction--infill
Council District: 24
Overlay: Richland-West End Addition Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1915811

Staff member Baldock presented the case for new construction at 414 Greenway. 414 Greenway is located at the corner of Hillsdale Avenue in Richland-West End. Currently on the lot is a c. 1932 secondary structure located at the back of the lot where an accessory structure would typically be located. The structure is considered to be contributing and will remain as part of the project. The application is to construct a duplex structure at the front of the lot, which is currently vacant.

The new duplex meets all base zoning requirements for setbacks. It faces Greenway Avenue, and is shifted slightly to the right of the lot, which is appropriate for a corner lot. The applicant is proposing two areas of parking for the duplex. One parking pad is at the rear, off the alley, behind the existing historic structure, which is appropriate. The other parking pad is accessed from Hillsdale Avenue, and is located between the duplex and the historic accessory structure. Although the commission typically discourages access to parking via a side street when an alley is available, staff finds this parking pad to be appropriate in this instance because the existing historic accessory structure prevents more parking from being situated off the alley. In addition, moving the parking closer to the alley, but off of Hillsdale, would mean creating parking in front of the historic structure, which would not be appropriate.

The duplex will be one and a half stories tall and approximately 29' tall from grade. It will be 43' wide and 73' deep, which meets the historic context. The front façade contains two entrances, one articulated with a pedimented porch, and the other, on the left, will appear like a window. The primary roof form is a side gable, and the front and rear facades have gabled dormers. The materials for the duplex include smooth-face cement fiberboard cladding, wood trim, split face block foundation, brick porch, wood windows, and composite shingle roof. Staff asks to approve all final materials prior to purchase and installation. The left side façade has a pedimented entryway to one of the duplex units. The duplex's proportion and rhythm of openings meet the historic context. The materials for the duplex include smooth-face cement fiberboard cladding, wood trim, split face block foundation, brick porch, wood windows, and composite shingle roof. Staff asks to approve all final materials prior to purchase and installation. Most of the historic development along Greenway is one to one and a half stories in height.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval with the conditions that (1) Staff review and approve the asphalt shingle color, materials for the front porch floor and steps and the rear porch framing, and all windows and doors; (2) The HVAC and all utilities be located at the rear of the duplex or on the side, beyond the midpoint of the house; and (3) Staff approve all appurtenances not called out on the plans.

Mr. Robinson explained that the design was chosen to match the neighborhood. The Commission had no questions for the applicant and there were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Gee expressed concern for the enclosed porch railing. Ms. Baldock explained that the applicant chose to have the railing because it made the second door look more like a window, but that it was not a direction given to the applicant.

from the staff. She further explained that there are historic examples of enclosed railings and so staff found it to be appropriate and showed an example of a similar situation.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the project with the conditions that:

- **Staff review and approve the asphalt shingle color, materials for the front porch columns, door and steps and the rear porch framing and all windows and door specifications prior to purchase and installation;**
- **The hvac and all utilities be located at the rear of the building or beyond the midpoint of the house; and**
- **Staff approve all appurtenances not called out on the plans.**

Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

m. 515 ACKLEN PARK DRIVE

Application: Demolition; New construction--infill

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Addition Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1915814

Staff member Baldock presented the cases for 515 and 517 together because they are two contiguous properties and the designs are very similar. The projects involve demolishing a c. 1956 mid-century ranch house that spans the two lots at 515 and 517 Acklen Park Drive, and constructing two duplex structures on the lots. In 2008, the commission approved, with conditions, a proposal to demolish the mid-century structure and to build a single family house at No. 515 and a duplex at No. 517. No permits were ever issued for the demolition and new construction, and this application represents a new design and proposal. Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the mid-century structure because its form, date of construction, and character do not match the historic context.

Both structures are meet all base zoning requirements and are oriented to face Acklen Park Drive. Each site will have two parking pads for a total of four cars. The parking pads are located at the rear of the property and are accessed via the alley, which is appropriate. The two duplex structures are similar in design, form, scale, and materials. Both structures will be one-and-a-half stories tall and will be about thirty feet tall from grade. Each house has a cross gabled roof form with front dormers, and each has two entryways, one behind a porch and one behind a shallow entryway. Staff asks that the front porch columns on No. 515 have a cap and a base. In addition, staff asks that on both projects, all double and triple window openings have a 4 to 6 inch mullion in between them. Both houses will be 34 feet wide and 45 feet, six inches deep. Their proportion and rhythm of openings meet the design guidelines. The materials for the projects include cement fiberboard, hardishakes, split face block, fiberglass shingles, and wood windows. Staff asks to approve all final materials prior to purchase and installation. Acklen Park Drive does not contain any contributing structures, so the historic context for the site can be found on Greenway Avenue and Murphy Road.

In conclusion, for No. 515 Acklen Park Drive, staff recommends approval with the following conditions: (1)The porch columns have a cap and a base; (2) Staff review and approve the shingle color, windows, doors, and materials for the front and rear porch columns, steps and floor; (3) Staff approve the material and design of a porch railing if one is installed; (4) 4 to 6" mullions be included between all double windows; (5) HVAC and other utilities be located at the rear of the structure, or on a side façade, beyond the midpoint of the house; and (6) Staff review any appurtenances not indicated on the submitted plans and elevations.

For No. 517 Acklen Park Drive, staff recommends approval with the following conditions: (1) Staff review and approve the shingle color, windows, doors, and materials for the front and rear porch columns, steps and floor; (2) Staff approve the material and design of a porch railing if one is installed; (3) 4 to 6" mullions be included between all double windows; (4) HVAC and other utilities be located at the rear of the structure, or on a side façade, beyond the midpoint of the house; and (5) Staff review any appurtenances not indicated on the submitted plans and elevations.

Applicant and architect Preston Quirk explained that they put in a lot of work to get the project to the point of having a staff recommendation and offered to answer any questions.

Commissioner Nielson moved to approve the project with the conditions that:

- **The porch columns have a cap and base.**
- **Staff review and approve the asphalt shingle color, the materials and specifications for all windows and doors, and the materials for the front and rear porch columns, steps and floor;**
- **Staff approve the material and design of the porch railing if one is installed**
- **Four to 6" mullions be included in between all double windows;**
- **The hvac and all utilities be located at the rear of the building or beyond the midpoint of the house; and**
- **Staff approve all appurtenances not called out on the plans.**

Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

n. 517 ACKLEN PARK DRIVE

Application: New construction--infill

Council District: 24

Overlay: Richland-West End Addition Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1915812

There was no discussion about this project specifically.

Commissioner Nielson moved to approve the project with the conditions that:

- **The porch columns have a cap and base.**
- **Staff review and approve the asphalt shingle color, the materials and specifications for all windows and doors, and the materials for the front and rear porch columns, steps and floor;**
- **Staff approve the material and design of the porch railing if one is installed**
- **Four to 6" mullions be included in between all double windows;**
- **The hvac and all utilities be located at the rear of the building or beyond the midpoint of the house; and**
- **Staff approve all appurtenances not called out on the plans.**

Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

o. 1614 BENJAMIN STREET

Application: New construction--infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Eastwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1915816

Staff member Baldock presented the case for 1614 Benjamin Street. The application is for the construction of new infill and a new accessory structure at 1614 Benjamin. In March 2013, the Commission approved the demolition of the contributing structure on the site on the grounds of economic hardship.

Both the new primary and the accessory structure meet all base zoning requirements for setbacks. The new structure will be located in approximately the same location as the historic structure. Its front setback will be approximately the average of its neighboring house's setbacks. The house will be located slightly off-center, towards the right of the lot. Staff finds this to be appropriate because other historic houses on this block are also located off center. The accessory structure will be situated in the rear of the property and will be accessed via the alley. An existing curb cut and parking pad at the front will remain, and a new sidewalk will be installed.

The proposed house will be one-and-a-half stories and will have a ridge height of 27'6" above grade. The house's width will be 29' and its depth will be 75' 2". Staff finds that the house's height and scale meet the historic context. The house will have a side gabled roof form with a shed roof dormer on the front. It has a full-width front porch and a recessed entryway. . The house will have a one-story rear extension. The design's proportion and rhythm of openings meets the design guidelines. The materials for the structure include cement fiberboard siding, shake siding, split face concrete block foundation, wood windows, wood porch columns, brick chimney, and architectural shingles. Staff asks to approve all final materials prior to purchase and installation.

The proposed garage will be one story and approximately 17'1" in height. It will be 22' by 23'6", or 517 square feet. The materials for the accessory structure are similar to those of the house and are appropriate. Staff finds that the accessory structure's location, setback, height, scale, orientation, and proportion and rhythm of openings are subordinate to the proposed primary structure and do not contrast greatly with the historic character of the neighborhood.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval with the following conditions: (1) Staff review and approve the asphalt shingle color, a brick sample, the window and door specifications, and the materials for the porch floor and step; (2)The utilities be located on the rear of the house, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house; and (3) Staff review and approve all appurtenances not included on the plans.

Scott Smith introduced himself and stated he was available for questions. There were no questions for the applicant and no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Gee stated that the parking pad in the front yard is not something they would typically approve but he understood it was existing. Ms. Baldock and Ms. Jones confirmed that Commission could only review requested changes. Ms. Baldock also pointed out that several homes on the block have existing driveways to the left of the home.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the project with the conditions that:

- **Staff review and approve the asphalt shingle color, a brick sample, the window and door specifications, and the materials for the porch floor and steps;**
- **Utilities be located on the rear of the house, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house; and**
- **Staff review and approve all appurtenances not included on the site plan.**

Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

p. 506 SOUTH 9TH STREET

Application: New construction – infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 1915458

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented 506 South and 508 South 9th Street together but requested separate motions.

Scott Smith with Pfeffer-Torode Architecture explained that they would like to keep the center windows on the upper stories as they feel that the proportion is appropriate and the windows are aesthetically pleasing.

There was no request from the public to speak and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Gee stated that two houses adjacent appear to be constructed in the late 1900s, which is older than most of the homes in the neighborhood. Styles from that era generally had taller windows and lower sills than a 1920s home. He agrees with both applicant and staff and that the large window is not out of proportion but that the windows on the ground floor should be taller, more vertical, and possibly with a lower sill.

Motion:

Commissioner Gee moved to approve the project with the conditions that:

- **The first floor, front façade windows match the height of the upper-story tallest window;**
- **The final selection of windows and doors, porch railing if needed, and the roof color be approved by staff;**
- **The front porch columns have bases and capitals; and**
- **Fences, paving, HVAC, lighting and other appurtenance approved by staff.**

Commissioner Fletcher seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

q. 508 SOUTH 9TH STREET

Application: New construction – infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 1915484

Motion:

Commissioner Gee moved to approve the project with the conditions that:

- **The first floor, front façade windows match the height of the upper-story tallest window;**
- **The final selection of windows and doors, porch railing if needed, and the roof color be approved by staff;**
- **The front porch columns have bases and capitals; and**
- **Fences, paving, HVAC, lighting and other appurtenance approved by staff.**

Vice-chairperson Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Jones, legal counsel for the Commission, stated that the public hearing may have not been opened for 515 and 517 Acklen Park Drive and recommended that they reopen the public hearing. There were no requests from the public to speak. There was no additional discussion and the decision was unchanged.

r. 2010 18TH AVENUE

Application: New construction-infill; Setback reduction

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1915982

The applicant proposes to construct a new single-family dwelling and detached two-car garage on a corner lot at 18th Avenue South and Bernard Street. This corner has been vacant at least since 1914, according to Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, and due to the low amount of development in the area at that time has likely always been vacant.

The house and garage meet the design guidelines in terms of scale, location, setbacks, rhythm of spacing, and roof shape. Staff recommends lowering the height of the garage by 1', which the applicant has agreed to do.

The majority of materials proposed also meet the design guidelines. More information is needed about the shutters, windows, trim, garage doors, and roof color; therefore staff recommends a condition that these items receive final staff review.

The orientation of the home is appropriate. The garage is oriented towards Bernard Street; however, there is a rear alley. Staff recommends that the vehicular entrances to the garage be oriented towards the alley as historically found in the district.

Orientation towards the alley would also eliminate the need for a twenty-five foot (25') wide driveway on Bernard Street.

The home across the street has a garage oriented towards Bernard Street; however, the garage is only a one-car garage which allows for a narrower driveway. Staff recommends a condition that the garage's vehicular entrances be oriented towards the alley. If the Commission disagrees, staff recommends that the street facing dormers sit back by a total of 2'. If the Commission does agree, staff recommends the addition of windows on the street facing side.

The windows are twice as tall as they are wide and meet the historic context. Typically the Commission has required a minimum of eight to thirteen feet (8'-13') between windows to meet the rhythm of openings found in the overlay. Staff recommends an additional window on the left side in the kitchen area to meet these criteria. As this is likely the location of upper kitchen cabinets, a shuttered window, would be appropriate.

Staff recommends approval of the single-family dwelling, outbuilding and setback reduction with the conditions that:

- Applicant submits additional information about windows, doors, trim and roof colors for final staff review;
- A shuttered window be added to the left side;
- Shutters have hinges and dogs, rather than being applied against the wall;
- The outbuilding be reoriented so that vehicular access is from the alley;
- Windows be added to the street facing side of garage (if reorientation of the garage is a condition);
- The height of the garage be lowered by one foot (1'); and
- Utility locations be located beyond the midpoint of the house.

With these conditions, Staff finds that the project meets II.B of the design guidelines for new construction and outbuildings.

Vice-chairperson Nielson and Commissioner Fletcher asked about the amount of coverage on the lot. Mr. Alexander explained that there was concern from the neighborhood but that Staff felt that the house was compatible with the neighborhood. He clarified that open space was more than lot coverage alone. In this case, it is a narrow lot but there is additional space between the lot line and the street that will provide the perception of more open space than actually appears on the site plan.

John Brittle, representing the applicant, explained that they presented multiple drawings to the staff in order to meet all the design guidelines. He first addressed the garage, stating that there was a garage across the street facing the street and because of the size of the alley and lot coverage, they felt the garage needed to stay oriented towards the street or otherwise will need to be pushed further into the lot in order to gain access from the alley. They also moved the stairwell to the accessory dwelling into the interior of the building and they would like to discuss the appropriateness of an exterior stair.

Jim Schmidt introduced himself as being an owner with his partner Joe Willey of 2006 18th Avenue South which is two doors down. First, he explained, the notification was only a short 7 day window so there may be others who have not had time to review the plans. Where it may be a very nice house it is not what they want to see in Belmont Hillsboro as it does not reflect the design of the street. The house width is too narrow because the lot width is too narrow. Members of the neighborhood association met with the architect and they have agreed to include some of the design changes such as different roofing materials, scaled down garage, real stone and brick of, and an outside window addition has been discussed. He would like the Commission to consider eliminating the back balcony for privacy reasons, requiring a sidewalk on Bernard and preserving some of the trees. He stated he was willing to support the setback reduction request, if these other issues were addressed.

Kristen Dinger at 2011 18th Avenue South, stated her property faces the proposed project. She found out about the meeting last Wednesday and another neighbor wanted to attend but couldn't get child care on such short notice. She expressed concerns about the chimney being too short, the house being too narrow, there being no sidewalk on Bernard and lot coverage.

Laura Garfield, 1705 Bernard, lives diagonal to the project. She explained that she had no objections but wanted to express concerns that the infrastructure to the neighborhood is outdated, alleys are not maintained, sewage draining hasn't been

touched for 70 years, and young mothers and carriages in the neighborhood use Bernard to gain access to the commercial buildings on Belmont.

Mr. Brittle explained that he requested a 35' wide house and staff felt like a 27.5 home was more appropriate because of the rhythm along the street and spacing between the houses. He understood that the guidelines didn't require them to perfectly match all the bungalows on the street. Every tree is a hackberry, he said, and he is confident that they can plant something back that is nice but that they will not be saving many if any of the existing trees.

Seeing no other requests to speak, Chairperson Tibbs closed the public hearing.

Susan Jones, read aloud their notification for setback reduction policy which stated that staff shall post a sign in the yard and the applicant shall mail notices at least 7 days in advance of the hearing.

Commissioner Fletcher asked the applicant if he would defer and meet with the neighbors one more time. Mr. Brittle said he was willing to consider that as he is always happy to meet with neighbors but that he has agreed to all their requests with the exception of taking away the rear balcony, a condition that the staff had found to be appropriate. The only request of the Commission was a consideration of the orientation of the garage which was something the neighbors did not address.

Commissioner discussed whether or not the project included a living-unit and what that would mean in terms of their decision. A Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit was the only way for the garage to be used as a living unit, and that was a different process and set of standards.

Commissioner discussed whether or not the lot was a legal lot.

Commissioner Kaalberg acknowledged that the narrowness of the lot required a house that was narrower than the context but he disagreed that the area between the lot and Bernard could be counted as greenspace as it would likely be a sidewalk at some point.

Ms. Jones explained that for existing streets you have the option of whether or not you contribute the sidewalk fund but review of sidewalks and infrastructure issues, are not reviewed by this board.

Commissioner Cantrell stated that she understood that technically the notification requirement had been met but that she was concerned about the notice. When you have a piece of property that has been vacant for years then it requires more notice than 7 days and people may go by it and not see it. She also stated that a sidewalk was very important. More neighborhood and architect conversation is needed, explained Commissioner Cantrell.

Motion:

Commissioner Gee moved to approve the project with the conditions:

- **Applicant submits additional information about windows, doors, trim and roof colors for final staff review;**
- **A shuttered window be added to the left side;**
- **Shutters have hinges and dogs, rather than being applied against the wall;**
- **The outbuilding be reoriented so that vehicular access is from the alley;**
- **Windows be added to the street facing side of garage (if reorientation of the garage is a condition);**
- **The height of the garage be lowered by one foot (1'); and**
- **Utility locations be located beyond the midpoint of the house.**

Commissioner Kaalberg seconded the motion and moved to amend the motion to clarify that the garage is not being approved as a detached accessory dwelling unit. Commissioner Gee seconded and the amended motion passed with Commissioners Nielson and Cantrell voting against it.

s. 1406 HOLLY STREET

Application: Demolition; New construction-infill

Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER
Permit ID #: 1916066 and 1916067

This project includes demolition of the existing house and construction of a new house.

Staff recommends demolition of the existing house—which is the center building on this slide—as its character, form, style and materials do not fit into the historic character of the district. Demolition will result in a more historically appropriate visual effect and so demolition meets the design guidelines.

This slide shows the proposed design in relationship to the immediate context. The new construction meets the design guidelines in terms of setbacks, rhythm of spacing, materials, roof shape, orientation, proportion and rhythm of openings, location of mechanicals and appurtenances.

The applicant plans to keep the existing garage and driveway.

The proposed house is a one and one-half story home, as are the majority buildings in the immediate vicinity.

The historic context along Holly Street varies greatly between seventeen and thirty-four feet (17'-34') tall from grade, with the closest homes being in the seventeen to twenty six foot (17'-26') range. The majority of Lockeland Springs-East End is very eclectic in style and massing, with homes ranging between one and three stories.

There are a few areas where all the development happened at the same time with homes very consistent in massing and style. This area is of the more eclectic variety, so although the properties immediately around the lot have shorter homes than what is proposed; staff did not find the condition to be an unusual for this portion of the district.

For instance, in the 1200 block of Holly Street there is an approximately twenty-one foot (21') tall house flanked by homes that are approximately thirty-two feet (32') tall from grade.

Just behind this proposed project, in the 1400 block of Russell Street, there is an approximately sixteen foot (16') tall building next to a twenty-five foot tall house.

The width of the front of the home is approximately twenty-five feet (25') and it gains in width about half way back to approximately thirty feet (30'). This is in keeping with the widths of neighboring historic buildings which vary between twenty five and thirty three feet (25'-33'). The depth of the building is almost exactly like the historic building to the left. The project meets section II.B.1 and 2.

Staff recommends approval of demolition and new construction; finding the project meets the design guidelines II.B. for new construction and IV.B for demolition.

Mr. Root answered Commissioner Kaalberg's question about square footage that it is about 2700 square feet. He explained that the design of the roofline was done in a way to hide the second story as much as possible and that the house is at the bottom of a dip and so the houses next to it will appear to be taller.

There were not requests from the public to speak and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Kaalberg expressed concern about the height due to the shorter buildings immediately around the new house. Mr. Root stated that staff added 3' to include the foundation and porch but they thought they could do it in 2' and they had already lowered the overall height by 1'. Strategy was to stairstep the massing of the house as you worked back into the lot

so that the main height will be about 26' off the porch. They could change the slope of the roof but it would change the entire look of the house.

Commissioner Gee said he couldn't believe it was a 2700 square foot house because it looks like a small cottage. He is concerned that there is a general sense that less is better in the community and if that were the case there are hundreds of homes that went up at the turn of the century that would be turned down. Throughout East Nashville there are incredible homes of varying scale and there are some areas with more of a pattern. Most of the homes had 11' ceiling and most of the home today didn't have 11' ceilings and we are squashing the proportions.

Commissioner Kaalberg agreed but said there is something to the pattern and to insert something remarkably taller that would be a problem, but he doesn't think that this one is necessarily too tall. His request is more in terms of maintaining a rhythm of ridges.

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the project based on staff recommendation. Commissioner Gee seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION MAY 15, 2013